

REMARKS

The applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the Application and request reexamination and reconsideration of the Application in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,708,833 to Kinney et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,105 to Wu et al. Applicants herein amend claim 1 to better define the invention. Support for this amendment can be found in Fig. 3 and the accompanying description at page 6, lines 5-15, and in claims 7 and 8. The amendment to claim 1 does not raise any new issues since claims 7 and 8 already recited that the circuit board could be a motherboard or add-in card, which is external to the jack module.

The subject invention results from the realization that a truly simple and effective jack module with integrated modem interface circuits which decouples the modem from the host system for purposes of independent homologation and certification while maintaining the benefits of having the modem on the system motherboard is effected by disposing the line side circuit in the jack housing and connecting the line side circuit to the jack contacts that engage with the contacts on a plug to be received while providing terminals to allow the jack housing to be easily connected/disconnected from the external system motherboard or add-in card.

Fig. 1 of Kinney et al. shows radio card 10 that may be inserted into a "receiving device" 11. Receiving device 11 has a plurality of pins 30 that are connected to a computer terminal (not shown). As the Examiner indicated, Kinney et al. describes that radio card 10 may also be a modem card 35 as shown in Figs. 2B and 2C. Kinney et al. does not teach,

disclose or suggest, however, a jack module with integrated modem interface circuits that includes a jack housing and a plurality of terminals in the housing that interconnect with an external circuit board, as claimed by Applicants. Rather, Kinney et al. shows a modem card 35 that is slid into receiving device 11 which does not include a circuit board or circuitry at all.

Kinney et al. also fails to disclose or suggest a jack module with integrated modem interface circuits. Instead, Kinney teaches a separate modem card that is slid into receiving device 11 that does not include any circuitry, such as a line side circuit as claimed by Applicants. Not only does Kinney et al. fail to disclose any circuitry within receiving device 11, Kinney et al. actually discloses that: “any necessary coupling transformer may be built within the computer terminal”. See column 7, lines 28-29. Thus, rather than teaching that modem interface circuitry may be integrated into a jack module, Kinney et al. teaches that it is more desirable to place circuitry, such as a coupling transformer, outside the jack housing and within a computer terminal. Thus, not only does Kinney et al. not teach the subject invention, it actually teaches away from it.

To overcome the deficiencies of Kinney et al., the Examiner combines it with Wu et al. Fig. 2 of Wu et al. shows adapter circuitry 11 that is plugged into printer port 13 of a host computer 18. Adapter circuitry 11 includes box 12 having A/D converter 207 and D/A converter 207 located therein. Wu et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest, however, a plurality of terminals on said housing interconnecting with an external circuit board. Rather, the Examiner refers to circuits 207 and 208 included within box 12 of adapter circuitry 11. Moreover, adapter circuitry 11 is plugged into printer port 13, rather than an external circuit board.

Thus, the combination of Kinney et al and Wu et al. fails to provide the subject invention as claimed by Applicants. Also, the combination of Kinney et al. and Wu et al. fails to suggest the invention as claimed by the applicants since adapter circuitry 11 of Wu et al. is connected to a printer port rather than to an external circuit board. As such, Wu et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kinney et al.

Claim 1 of the subject application as amended recites: “[a] jack module with integrated modem interface circuits comprising: a jack housing for receiving a plug; a plurality of contacts in said housing for engaging contacts on a plug; a plurality of terminals on said housing interconnecting with an external circuit board; and a line side circuit integrated in said jack housing interconnecting with said contacts”. As described above, neither Kinney et al. or Wu et al., either alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest a jack module with integrated modem interface circuits that includes a housing and a plurality of terminals on the housing interconnecting with an external circuit board. Thus, claims 1-13 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Kinney et al. and Wu et al.


The Examiner rejects claims 4-5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,753 to Baginy et al.; claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,409 to Scott et al.; claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. in view of Scott et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,422 to Tran; claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent

No. 5,783,999 to Price et al.; claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. in view of Price et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,150 to Bingel et al.; claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,506,254 to Right et al.; claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,973,948 to Hahn et al.; claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. in view of Price et al. and in further view of Scott et al.; and claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinney et al. in view of Wu et al. in view of Price et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,117 to Armistead et al.

Applicants have clearly described above how claim 1 is patentable over the prior art. Since claims 1-17 each depend from claim 1, each of these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons stated above and are further patentable since they recite one or more additional features.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or his associates collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Poirier
Reg. No. 43,007